



1924, Introducing “Modernism”

The Deep Archive in the Age of WWWisibility

Philipp Rößler

HUMBOLDT-UNIVERSITÄT ZU BERLIN

*But can those have been possible seeing that they never were?
Or was that only possible which came to pass? [...]
It must be a movement then, an actuality of the possible as possible.
(James Joyce, Ulysses)*

*Mendel's concept of the laws of genetics was lost to the world for a generation because
his publication did not reach the few who were capable of grasping and extending it;
and this sort of catastrophe is undoubtedly being repeated all about us,
as truly significant attainments become lost in the mass of the inconsequential.
(Vannevar Bush, "As We May Think")*

Between¹ October 2015 and November 2016 the face of Modernism changed, its complexion changed.² It regained some of its originality – regained it because its originality has become more visible, even if this change of complexion remains overlooked. In this overlooking the scholarly narrative of Modernism has forgotten itself, or rather it has forgotten to interrogate itself about itself in one important respect.

The common assumption in the critical literature on Modernism is that the question “[W]hat is Modernism?,”³ asked in 1924 by John Crowe Ransom – Ransom did not dare to venture an answer to his question beyond stating “It is undefined”⁴ – was answered at least somewhat comprehensively and in a movement-defining way for the first time in 1927 by Laura Riding and Robert Graves’s *A Survey of Modernist Poetry* or in 1931 by Edmund Wilson’s *Axel’s Castle*,⁵ in the latter of course under the imprint ‘Symbolism.’⁶ Most scholars of Modernism assessing the critical value of Riding and Graves’s contribution hold that in 1927 “it was [...] too early for a more comprehensive critical synthesis or for a critical assessment of the concept of modernism.”⁷ In fact, the question “What is Modernism?” was answered, comprehensively and in a movement-defining way in the very same year the question was put, namely in 1924. However, this early answer has gone astray in the deep archive. Which answer? It will be necessary to approach the answer to the question of the answer through another question.

What are the conditions for something written – handwritten, typewritten, printed – to have an effect? Primarily it have been the following: being published, being accessible, being read. It goes without saying that not all writings are published and that nowhere near all that is published is being read. These facts per se do not present an issue. It becomes an issue only if what is not taken note of

would make a difference, perhaps all the difference, were it to be noticed. Writings consigned to the deep archive will hardly make a difference. These matters of course are changing. Online visibility is becoming *the* condition for something writing to have an effect. Deep archive documents such as the one which is the topic of this paper remain below the visibility threshold.

I have repeatedly used the term *deep archive* as if its meaning is self-evident. The term will be understood here as an imagined totality, *imagined* like ‘the canon,’ consisting of all those documents which are archived somewhere and are accessible in principle, but are generally not so *de facto* because they are invisible to the currently common research search strategies and/or access to them requires expenditure on a deterrent scale. Thus deep archive documents are characterized precisely by *not* being visible online. As in the case of the *deep web*,⁸ there is an immeasurable amount of documents which remain hidden for our common search strategies. More often than not it is a matter of coincidence, or Serendipity, if a document of the deep archive is taken note of after all. The term archive is used in a broad sense here which encompasses the archives of institutions which are not archives in the narrow sense. Already before the internet and the World Wide Web radically altered our information behavior, some documents, even documents in libraries, were characterized by a lower degree of visibility than others. As a consequence of the considerable and steady increase of so called digital content and its easy findability through the use of search engines, today’s visibility threshold effectively spells *wwwisible*. In our digital days and with this new *de facto* visibility threshold, those documents which are not findable online have become invisible more than ever; to the extent that even documents ‘stored’ in document-preserving institutions can be(come) invisible. The document which this paper sets out to exemplify illustrates quite well the digital revolution and its effect. ‘Born’ as an exemplary deep archive document, accessible to only a few people, invisible to anybody else, it has become more and more visible through the technical revolution which we call the internet.

Which document? This question converges with the ‘Which answer?’ question above. The answer to both questions is: Elias Arnesen’s unpublished study “Modernism and Literature” from 1924. Written at the University of Washington, the study is Arnesen’s PhD thesis, the specimen copy of which

was archived at University of Washington library in 1924. Due to its being unpublished, Arnesen's study, written with the explicit aim of making it a starting point – "to write an *introductory aesthetic*"⁹ as it reads –, was never involved in the formation of the concept it set out to introduce. And yet Arnesen's study may be termed programmatic in its obvious ambition to define and to present an outline of "modernist literature" (see 294f). The two paragraphs which introduce Arnesen's study may give an idea of this programmatic ambition:

It may seem unwarranted if not presumptuous to write about modernist literature. Does it even exist? [...] Yes, modernist literature exists,¹⁰ and – one is tempted to add – it flourishes. Moreover, symptoms of a pronounced character appear, upon comparative research, to hint at a definite interchange of methods, of aims, between the several arts and literature. It is erroneous to think that the phenomenon is callow, though it present [...] the earmarks of youth, for it has attained to many an excellence during the more than three decades of its experimental growth. (1)

In his study, which the following pages will outline and put into context, Arnesen attempts to describe the context of modernist art, its literary manifestations and predecessors. As mentioned above, his aim is, explicitly stated, "to write an *introductory aesthetic*" (2, Arnesen's emphasis) of "modernist literature." In his conclusion Arnesen refers to his "writing of an historical account of the trend" (294) and to the necessity of the "definition of its exact nature" (ibid.). The final sentence of his study considers its "originality" to be not only his "attempt to delineate the main features, the fundamental distinctions of modernism in literature" (295) but to be also the comparative character of his approach (see ibid.). Arnesen's approach is comparative not merely in the sense of 'comparative literature' but also in the sense of consideration and comparison of "the whole field of modernist production" (3), including "marionettes, [...] pantomime, [...] Javanese silhouettes, [...] the Clavilux, [...], Monodrama, Cubist ballet, Bat Theatre, Batik, porcelain work, linoleum cuts, Expressionist cinema" (29), etc. This approach he calls one of "correlation, of historicity, and of aesthetic 'fundamentalism'" (3) and names Hippolyte Taine, Georg Brandes and Élie Faure as representatives. "[M]odernism," Arnesen declares, "is no isolated phenomenon [...] [and] the proximity and definiteness of the event [of modernism] – of good standing now almost – challenges the attention of those who still can get it first hand" (2). He holds "a study of it [...] [to be] especially pertinent," because, as he points out, "there

is an entire absence of a survey that deals with the new methods and new values comprehensively and finally" (ibid.).

Hugh Kenner, one of the proponents of a specific modernist canon, wrote in "The Making of the Modernist Canon": "As recently as 1931 [...] it [the canon of literary Modernism] was not made, was not even adumbrated."¹¹ Adumbrated it was, unseen. And the breadth of this adumbrated 'canon' from 1924 is remarkable. In four chapters Arnesen discusses, in separate sections devoted to each of these writers, Cummings – whom Arnesen considers "represent[ing] a happy union of the plastic and literary talent and hence [...] [a] symbol of the close rapport that exists between modernist art and letters" (54) –, Joyce, Eliot, and Stevens as representatives of "Abstraction"; Proust, Woolf, Frank, and Werfel as representatives of "Expressionism"; Strindberg, Rolland, and Cabell as representatives of "Synthesis;"¹² Anderson, Gorky, and Lawrence as representatives of "The Naturalist Tradition." Arnesen's modernism is nothing short of international, though not global, covering a large array of expressions of art – *Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari* is mentioned, Vollmoeller and Reinhardt's *Das Mirakel*, Nijinsky's *L'Après-midi d'un faune*, Diaghilev's *Petrushka* to name just a few examples. International in this respect means that Arnesen's focus is on European and U.S. American writers, including Russian literature which is not a matter of course when one is speaking about 'European focus.' The English-language Imagists are discussed in connection with the Russian Имажинисты for instance (see 70ff). In addition to a plethora of writers' names, references to Archipenko, Cézanne, Diaghilev, Jacob Epstein, Gaudier-Brzeska, Hunecker, Kandinsky, Klee, Kokoschka, Matisse, Erich Mendelsohn, Munch, Nevinson, O'Keeffe, Ornstein, Picasso, Rodin, Rouault, Bertrand Russell, Morgan Russell, Schoenberg, Stieglitz, Stravinsky, Bruno Taut, among others, throng the pages of his study. At the same time Arnesen's study marks one of the beginnings of (the process of) "'modernism' [...] becom[ing] an increasingly literary configuration."¹³ Had it been in a position to have an effect on the discourse of Modernism, perhaps Modernism would have been from the very beginning the international phenomenon comprising various art forms which it is considered today.

If compared with Bradbury and McFarlane's volume *Modernism*, the names which are not to be found in Arnesen are Gide, Kafka, Musil, Valéry, Forster and Williams – as is well known 1924 was the

year of Kafka's death, and of Joseph Conrad's, but it is also the year of publication of the first instalment of *Work in Progress*, of Mann's *Der Zauberberg* and of Richards's *Principles of Literary Criticism*. Furthermore, 1924 was perhaps too early for Faulkner, Hemingway and Brecht to be included. Gertrude Stein is mentioned but in the chapter on Wallace Stevens Arnesen writes "[r]ightfully this should be about Gertrude Stein, but there is little available material" (88). Nearly all the other names gathered in Bradbury and McFarlane's volume, a fairly long list as the index shows, are mentioned by Arnesen. Of course the focus is on some more than on others. Arnesen devotes more space on Proust than on any other individual writer, and one can sense his admiration for his work; Proust's *À la recherche* he calls a "signal achievement" (107). Only Joyce, whom he discusses within one third of the space devoted to Proust, seems to "hold ground as an equal" (109). Stein, in contrast, does not emerge unscathed from Arnesen's consideration. Referring to Joyce as "perhaps the foremost modernist prosateur" (54) "across the sea" (*ibid.*), he calls *Ulysses* "a book for all and for none [...] a 'virtuoso' of many styles" (*ibid.*).¹⁴ His conclusion about *Ulysses* reads: "Joyce [...] depletes, disenchant, often wearies you. The entire antebellum culture is, on its final Odyssey, kissed adieu. [...] Joyce has done it all, and has anticipated future combinations of literary productions" (63). Ultimately, Arnesen, who does not have little regard for the writers he studies in his thesis, on the contrary, considers works like *Ulysses* and *The Waste Land* daring failures, perhaps because they did not afford him the sense of completeness he had accustomed himself to expect from literary works. About *Ulysses* he writes "Incomplete, a failure, *Ulysses* is yet, essentially the most magnificent voyage of our day..." (*ibid.*). *The Waste Land* he considers "too sophisticated and cryptic with its poly-lingual quotations, its over-frequent literary allusions. [...] Were it a magistral document of futility, that is, had it an ethical fury it would indeed mirror the world and move the people in it" (84). From Arnesen's study could be derived a canon of Anglophone modernist writers, but just as well a canon prefiguring the international and open one of the current conception of Modernisms. The Harlem Renaissance, it must be noted, does not occur in Arnesen. "The African René Maran" (290), recipient of the prix Goncourt in 1921, is mentioned – although Maran was Guyanese. Arnesen's view was international indeed but he also thought that the United States, which he calls "the home of mechanized abstraction" (42), and about

which he writes with a blend of admiration and disconcertment (see 7ff, 42), occupy “a leading position as directional force” (2) of modernism.

How does Arnesen conceptualize modernism? His use of the terms *modernism* and *modernist* is difficult to pinpoint semantically. It is certainly broader than ‘literary movement’ and more specific than ‘the present (age)’, for the description of which Arnesen seems to use the term *modernity* (see 18-28).¹⁵ It is probably appropriate to approach the meaning of these two aforementioned terms as used by Arnesen by outlining its ‘tendency and mindset in art from the 1890s to the early 1920s’ (see 1f, 212, 204).¹⁶ Arnesen describes modernist literature as a “phenomenon” of “more than three decades of [...] experimental growth” (1), that is, as having its beginnings in the last decade of the nineteenth century (see 195ff). His emphasis is on the influence exerted by the developments in the arts; but “the great fountains of modernist inspiration [are]: Dostoevsky, Baudelaire, Nietzsche, Ibsen, Flaubert and Walt Whitman” (1) too. The term abstraction, as one of his chapters is entitled, provides an example of what Arnesen means when he writes of the “definite interchange of methods, of aims” (ibid.) between the arts and literature, of their “reciprocity” (2) and of the “vital relationship between modernist arts and letters” (40). By “abstractionism” Arnesen understands “a process in art eliminating representational elements” (41, Arnesen’s emphasis) and “preoccupation with technique” (92, Arnesen’s emphasis). Abstraction is identified by him as one of the features of what he calls modernism. Asserting that “the early symptoms of abstraction may be said to show in Symbolist, Naturalist, and Cubist sources” (ibid.), he considers the works of Cézanne, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Flaubert, and Cubism to already exhibit “the preoccupation with technique” (see 92-95). Like ‘modernism,’ ‘abstraction’ was of course another catch word of the time’s discourse on art. Joyce’s and Eliot’s works, for instance, Arnesen categorizes as abstractionist. Stressing the growth and thus continuity of the development there is also the sense of rupture when Arnesen suggests that the period spanning the second half of the 1910s and the first half of the 1920s was one of radical change by stating that “the artist of, say 1924, contrasts radically with his rival of eight years ago” (5).¹⁷ But in Arnesen this radical change is one of the mind, of *mentalité*, before it is one of ‘technique,’ approach or ‘movement.’ Thus, in Arnesen an alternative conception of ‘modernism’ emerges, an account which

does not shy away from speculative analysis of ‘the modernist mind’ and ‘the modernist consciousness’ (see ch. 1 “The Creative Spirit”), proceeding from the assumption that the increasingly complex conditions (see ch. 2 “Modernity”) and the new intensity to which it is exposed shape it and consequently also contemporary art. In order to explain the “phenomenon” (1ff) of modernist art, Arnesen does consider it a requirement to explain “how the mind of the modernist works” (5).¹⁸

According to Arnesen, the modernist sensibility, reflected in the general consciousness and in the works alike, is marked by “complexity, intensity, mobility, [and] abstraction” (28). Modern industrial society has brought about “not only a general speeding up but has likewise given rise to a mood of restlessness” (5) and he asserts “[t]his twentieth century day we are quickened by a new intensity” (17). The defining experiences of the age, those characterizing “the general complexity of the [present] age” (18), are industrialization, “the ferment of revolution” (8), and the World War, all of which contribute to what Arnesen considers the prevailing “sceptical temper” (18). Writing in 1923/1924, Arnesen mentions the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the defeat of the Spartacist uprising in postwar Germany and the assassination of Luxemburg und Liebknecht, he refers to “the black days under the benignant sign of the [Weimar] tricolor” (25),¹⁹ mentions Mussolini’s and the Fascists’ recent March on Rome (see 25f), the Indian unrest lead by Gandhi, and refers to “the revolutionary tendencies in Hungary, Finland, Ireland, Turkey, Mexico, Siberia” (26). “[C]olonial exploitation” (19; see also 22) is another international issue pointed to. Of the World War (18), “that war of wars” (22), Arnesen writes, fifteen years before that next war of wars,

Yes, modernity has expressed passionate – if unwise – purpose through machines, steel-structures and Big Berthas. For long these have been the Holy Trinity of outward Occidentalism. They make up in a larger semblance the mammoth industrial plants, the world-cities jammed against the sky and the internecine struggle among the nations. (24)

A passage about industrialization, whose effects on existence Arnesen characterizes as “mechaniz[ing] and dehumaniz[ing]” (19), reminiscent, if considered from retrospect, of Chaplin’s “Modern Times” (1936) reads:

[M]echanization has reached steely limbs into every channel of individual and social living [...]. The house sheltering man is knocked together in a jiffy: with pretense it flashes nickel-plumbing and plastered walls tinted harshly. Canned and boiled to a weak finish is the food he

gulps down. At night he appears in his 'ready-tailored' impatient to motor down to stare stereotyped screen-plots in the face, or to jerk to rhythms from dark jungles. Thus man is having a 'good time'. – And during day he feeds machinery, or 'assembles' at an immense belt, or 'punches' an adding machine. He is having a great time working, too! (20)

Arnesen contrasts "the machine as enslaver" (ibid.) with "the machine subjugated to the needs of the creative intelligence" (ibid.): "Subject to intellectual mastery our jazz, enginery, urbanism ascend into poetic permanency" (21). Mechanization is readily linked by Arnesen with "abstractionism" in the arts (see 42, 27).

The resulting modernist artist's mind, or "modernist 'consciousness'" (2, 17), he characterizes as "*complex*" (5, Arnesen's emphasis) and as marked by "the *tension* of congested living" (ibid.; Arnesen's emphasis) and by "a very personal *intuitionism*" (6; Arnesen's emphasis). Industrial development "propels him [the contemporary artist] and constrains him willy-nilly to accept its *dynamism*" (5, Arnesen's emphasis). "[O]ffended with orthodoxy" (ibid.) the modernist artist is "a moderate sceptic" (ibid.). Arnesen emphasizes in this respect "how directly the moderns are in touch with the present" (19). This mental make-up results in "two principal ideals" (6) which characterize the modernist artist's idea of art, namely the tendency to *synthesis*" (ibid., Arnesen's emphasis) – by which Arnesen means the fusion of "[c]ertain elements of subject matter, certain canons of style that once were discrete" (194f), Arnesen's paradigm of "literary synthesis" is Dante's *Commedia* (see 193, 247) – and "the will to *abstraction*" (6, see also 294; Arnesen's emphasis). Here is Arnesen's example of the "flow of impressions" (8) the modernist mind – revealingly Arnesen employs the example of "a stroller on Fifth Avenue" (7) (New York City is his modernist incubator (see 7-13)),²⁰ who could just as well happen to be Alexander Archipenko (see 11f) – is subject to:

By vast rhythmic jerks the traffic swims onward, halts, pauses, dashes, onward ... swayed by commanding gestures from traffic towers. And in the penetralia of this enormous movement cubistic flash and edge cut stingingly into vibrant flesh and lodge there the modernist kaleidoscope of displays. (7)

Arnesen's dissection of the modernist mind can indeed be read as the appropriation of the stream of consciousness as an analytical tool for explaining the modernist mind.

What is the context of Arnesen's study of modernism and of his use of this term? – this is the principal question of the following pages. Already in the early 1910s the terms *modernism* and *modernist(s)* were catch words, buzz words in the discourse on art which could be used positively and negatively for such art which was seen as making every effort to stand out against that which preceded it.²¹ And more often than not the artists designated as *modernist(s)* in the early 1910s were painters rather than sculptors, composers and writers – for post-1913 examples of the terms' use the Armory Show of that year constitutes a significant background – although the broader reference 'art (in general)' almost always resonates. Arnesen would have found the term modernists for instance in J. Nilsen Laurvik's "Intolerance in Art" from 1913 designating painters but also suggesting that they are "merely a part of a world-wide movement of spiritual and intellectual evolution that finds its analogies in all the arts; music, sculpture, literature and the drama are likewise affected."²² Laurvik would repeat the views expressed here in 1915 in a more broadly conceived way in the catalog of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco.²³ Arnesen would have found them in Christian Brinton's "Evolution Not Revolution in Art" from 1913 as well. Writing about "modernism in art,"²⁴ Brinton is here referring to Marinetti and Stein among others and to Mallarmé as precursor.²⁵ In Brinton's "Modernism in Art" from 1921 Arnesen would have found his conceptual terms:

From Paris to Petrograd, and from Stockholm to Barcelona, it was the same story of enthusiastic young men and young women, and some not so young, turning in increasing numbers to the new evangel of modernism. Satiated with realism, impressionism, and painstaking illusionism, they welcomed the *abstract* and *synthetic* appeal of the new art with avidity.²⁶

In fact, Brinton refers the late 1900s in this passage. Cézanne is the great progenitor of abstraction in Arnesen's study (see 1, 12, 21, 92f), a role which Arnesen could have found in Laurvik's *Is It Art?* from 1913 as well as in Brinton's aforementioned pieces from the same year and in his "Modernism in Art."²⁷ Both J. Nilsen Laurvik (1877-1953), Norwegian like Arnesen himself, and Christian Brinton (1870-1942) wrote for *The American-Scandinavian Review* among other things during the 1910s and 1920s.²⁸ *The American-Scandinavian Review* is a case in point with respect to the use of the terms *modernism*, *modernist*, *modernists* – these terms are to be found in its pages beginning in the first issue from 1913

and turn up again and again there during the 1910s and 1920s.²⁹ If Arnesen was familiar with the journal cannot be established.

In any case these terms, *modernism* and *modernist*, were apt to rouse emotions in either direction. Browse the pages of any *Vanity Fair* (1913-1936) issue from 1914 on,³⁰ and you will come across them in articles on art, in ads for hats and in general references to contemporary attitudes, to the *Zeitgeist* – they were signs of the times.³¹ Jean Cocteau's piece "Parade: Ballet Réaliste" which appeared in the September 1917 issue of *Vanity Fair* is an illustrative example.³² It is an advertisement and a defense of the ballet which had premiered in May of that year in Paris and which was a collaboration of Cocteau, who wrote the scenario for the ballet; Erik Satie, who composed the music; Picasso, who designed the set and the costumes; Sergei Diaghilev, the father of the *Ballets Russes*; and Leonide Massine, one of the *Ballets Russes's* choreographers. It is thus not surprising that Cocteau's *Vanity Fair* piece carried the sub-heading "In Which Four *Modernist* Artists Had a Hand,"³³ referring to the writer, the composer, the painter, and the choreographer. If Cocteau himself used the term or if it was born of the editors' initiative cannot be ascertained. But the *Vanity Fair* art staff knew only too well the provocative potential of the term *modernist* and was ready to make use of it in their magazine. In London's magazines the terms *modernism* and *modernist* were occasionally used as well in the early 1910s, e.g. in Holbrook Jackson's 1911 plea for "a change of attitude towards [recent] art" in Murry's *Rhythm*,³⁴ i.e. toward the works of Picasso among other things: "The modernist art movement requires a modernist appreciation or it is wasted."³⁵ In 1912, for instance, Edith A. Browne reports her "enthusiastically appreciative" experience of "the Modernist Painters" art in *The Freewoman*,³⁶ opening with the public *peccavi* for having missed the London Post-Impressionist exhibition of 1910/11.

So who were those modernists referred to when the term was used with respect to the realm of literature? In 1903 *moderniste* (in French) could refer to Jules Laforgue.³⁷ In 1911 modernist could mean "the shadowy, appalling Destinies of Ibsen, the agonizing glooms of Hauptmann's *Weavers*, the ethereal symbolism of Maeterlinck's *Joyzelle*, the pagan ardors of D'Annunzio's *Ship*."³⁸ In 1913 it could point to Mallarmé, Marinetti and Stein.³⁹ In 1916 it could mean Richard Aldington, Ezra Pound, Amy

Lowell, Carl Sandburg, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Imagists, Vorticists,⁴⁰ even Bach.⁴¹ In 1917 'modernists' could refer disparagingly to Pound, Amy Lowell and Imagist poets,⁴² in 1918 disparagingly to "the camp of the *vers libristes*" and Gertrude Stein (or rather to "'G. S.'").⁴³ In all of these cases 'modernist' was a notion, a catch word rather than an elaborated term or concept.

There are only very few elaborations with respect to the semantic ambit of this term such as Arnesen's from 1924 – an implicit elaboration as Arnesen never defines or even discusses the term itself – and Montmorency's from 1911. James Edward Geoffrey de Montmorency was editor of the literary supplement of *The Contemporary Review* in which he explained the term *modernism* in 1911.⁴⁴ Montmorency's elaboration is interesting because it provides a context for Virginia Woolf's dictum about the turning point 1910 – which Arnesen dates between 1916 and 1924 – by corroborating "this sense of 'newness.'"⁴⁵ According to Montmorency it is "the modernism of a rare age"⁴⁶ which comprehends "the new horizon"⁴⁷: "[S]ome moments of time are, in fact, great generating moments in progress. A *completely new outlook*, a strange and perhaps terrifying horizon, appears before [...] man."⁴⁸ Montmorency writes

[I]n such an age 'modernism' has a peculiarity worthy of definition, for it means *something added to the human spirit* which is not a mere phase of mind belonging to the early twentieth century [...], but is a new possession of all men for all time. We can never go back from this particular modernism unless an astral catastrophe intervenes. We are armed with new instruments of progress: with our time-telescopes we sweep the horizons of history, and watch the evolution of life; with our space-telescopes [...] we investigate the structure and the evolution of the physical universe; with our mind-telescopes we survey the nature of personality, the inter-relation of species and races, the whence and whither of the Ego; while the telescope of Religion herself is for the moment at rest since her daughter sciences are one and all engaged in establishing the certitude for which she stands.⁴⁹

Concerning the title of his essay, "Modernism and Literature," too, for Montmorency "the signs of the times seem to indicate the advent before very many years are passed of a great literary epoch: for the time is at hand when our age, and not merely the specialists of our age, will *realise the newness of it all*."⁵⁰

The 1910s were of course not the 'birth decade' of the terms since *modernisme* and *moderniste* were not uncommon terms in French writing on art of the 1880s, 1890s and 1900s.⁵¹ In 1903, in a piece, written in German, on recent developments in the French language, Johann Baptist Schlachter,

teacher of French at one of the German *Staatsrealschulen* (public secondary schools) in Prague (in the near distance of the house where Rilke was born), considers the vogue of the suffixes *-isme* and *-iste*, the use of which he regards as linked to the “scholars’ and artists’ circles.”⁵² *Moderniste* and *modernisme* are among the neologisms he lists as the “most recent [...] which are not even included in the great Sachs-Villatte from 1899 [...] or at least not with the meaning which they have here.”⁵³ His definitions read: “*modernisme*: the latest art movement. *Les horreurs du modernisme architectural* [...]. Correspondingly, *moderniste*: adherent of the latest art movement.”⁵⁴ According to Schlachter, the French word “[*m*]oderne has become established a long time ago, and from it are derived, based on thousands of examples: *moderniser, modernisme, moderniste, modernité*.”⁵⁵ Schlachter writes in his lexicographic explanation, “[t]he concrete *-iste* corresponds to the abstract *-isme*. Just as the one denotes the adherents of a new theory, the proponents of a new movement, the supporters of a new man, so the other denotes the new theory, the new movement, the new system itself.”⁵⁶ Having stated that “both suffixes have not been spared the pejorative meaning. [...] Therefore *-isme, -iste* are readily used to denounce eccentric views and ridiculous opinions,” (ibid., 9),⁵⁷ he emphasizes that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish if the terms are used in a pejorative sense or not.⁵⁸

Having provided a bit of context for Arnesen’s matter-of-course use of the term modernism, it is time to ask and to answer the question ‘Who is Elias Arnesen?’. Elias Thorleif (Ruud) Arnesen was born on June 12th 1893 in Oslo, Norway.⁵⁹ He came to the United States in 1919, that is, at the age of twenty-five or twenty-six, and, according to one source, attended Columbia University and The New School for Social Research sometime between 1919 and 1921.⁶⁰ Arnesen earned his A.B. in 1921, his M.A. in 1922 – with a thesis on Knut Hamsun, about whom he published an article in 1921 (Hamsun had been awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature a few months before) in *The Pacific Review*⁶¹ – and his Ph.D. in 1924; all three of his degrees he earned at University of Washington (in Seattle) where he studied under Vernon Louis Parrington. After a brief stint of teaching at Oregon Agricultural College, he became a professor of the English Department at San Francisco State Teachers College and San Francisco State College, as it was later called, and taught there from 1928 until 1962. Arnesen was the founder of the Humanities Division at San Francisco State and was also the Division’s chairman from

1947 to '62. He died on March 23rd 1983; a few days after Rebecca West (six months his senior) had died, whom he mentioned briefly in his study; a few weeks after *Vanity Fair* had been revived; in a year in which a volume entitled *Innovation/Renovation: New Perspectives on the Humanities* appeared containing essays such as “Intellectual History and Defining the Present as ‘Postmodern’” and “Modernisms/ Postmodernisms” by a certain Malcolm Bradbury.⁶²

Why, it is worth asking, did Arnesen write his PhD thesis about contemporary literature when until the 1930s this was not a common subject at U.S. American universities at all? A piece on Arnesen mentions him studying under Vernon Louis Parrington at University of Washington – yet Parrington was not known for his orientation toward contemporary literature.⁶³ The little space Parrington intended to devote to the “new literary fashions,”⁶⁴ as the last chapter of the third volume of his three-volume *Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920* was to be called, unfinished when he died in 1929, indicates the major contrast between Arnesen’s interest in contemporary literature and his teacher’s general indifference. However, until 1921 the Canadian Victor L. O. Chittick was among the Washington faculty as assistant professor. Chittick “introduced an innovative course in contemporary literature” at University of Washington,⁶⁵ which he continued to teach at Reed College from 1921 on, and it is not difficult to imagine that Arnesen, who finished his A.B. at University of Washington in 1921, encountered his “modernist” canon here. Arnesen’s actual PhD supervisor was Herbert Ellsworth Cory who had come to University of Washington only in 1923.

In contrast to Riding and Graves’ and Wilson’s studies, Arnesen’s, being unpublished, was not in the position to have an effect on the Modernism discourse. In the case of unpublished dissertations – Arnesen never ‘turned the thesis into a book’ –, for instance, and unpublished dissertations are just one category of documents consigned to the deep archive, we are talking about written scholarly studies which could have had an impact on the academic discourse but did not because nobody took note of them. This is due to the inconvenience which the deep archive represents for research. Thus there was no opportunity for Arnesen’s study to influence our conception of Modernism – as a document of the deep archive it was simply overlooked and unknown. Therefore it is absent in “the

first book [*Modernism: Evolution of an Idea*] to trace the development of the term ‘modernism’ from its origin in the early twentieth century through its consolidation in anthologies and classrooms to its radical expansion in recent decades.”⁶⁶ Given the fact that the genealogy of *Modernism*, its conceptual history has been a focus of research in the field for decades and has attracted scholars’ attention anew with the shift of focus from *Modernism* to *Modernisms* within the last two decades, it is an unexpected absence to some extent. For an excellent volume such as Latham and Rogers’ *Modernism: Evolution of an Idea* from 2015, concerned with “explor[ing] the shifting history of the idea” of “modernism” and with “the *formulation* [...] of modernism,”⁶⁷ Arnesen’s study would constitute the very object of search and research.

Due to the increasing visibility of a part of the documents of the deep archive it was certainly less easy for Arnesen to be overlooked in 2015 than it was, say, in 2000. His study could almost be called the classic example of a deep archive document become visible. This process from being below the visibility threshold to becoming visible of course required the so called digital revolution, the ongoing, massive shift not only in text’s and book’s object form from tangible to digital but also in the practice and approach of searching and finding from ‘analog’/non electronic to digital/electronic. Perhaps, and for whatever reasons, Arnesen never intended his study to be known to the scholarly community of his field. But of course being a PhD thesis his study did come to the attention of a handful of persons. At the least it solicited the attention of his thesis supervisor and of the librarian at University of Washington library who archived the specimen copy in 1924, the year of submission. It also necessarily compelled the attention of the librarian who created the catalog record of the thesis for the library’s card catalog. Apart from those directly concerned with the preparation and archiving of the thesis, only those presumably very few who read the bibliographic references to Arnesen’s study in the University of Washington’s 1931 volume *Digests of Theses, 1914-1931*,⁶⁸ containing a long abstract, and in the 1932 volume of the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*,⁶⁹ without an abstract and wrongly giving the ‘publication’ date 1931, have had an idea of this study.

And here contingency in the guise of technological development comes into play. Having a record in a single library card catalog, and very probably not being open-stack shelved, meant a very low

visibility of the archived research document. Through the transfer of library card catalog records into electronic catalogs which eventually became connected and accessible for almost everybody due to the development of the internet and of the World Wide Web, Arnesen's study became more visible, in principle. According to University of Washington Libraries, the electronic catalog record for the thesis was created in 1989 and thus was findable in the Washington catalog. It became more conveniently findable when the OPAC became a web-based OPAC in the 1990s. More importantly, since 1989 the catalog record could be found in WorldCat as well, meaning that the record could be found in OCLC's union catalog which could be accessed at any OCLC member library in the U.S., and could be accessed increasingly from beyond the United States. WorldCat, too, became more and more accessible for an increasing number of users in the 1990s and 2000s through web-based availability of its services. Visibility of Arnesen's study once again increased when, due to OCLC's collaboration with Google, today's information search monopolist, beginning in 2008 WorldCat resources, i.e. bibliographic metadata, became findable through Google Books and through Google Scholar. Thus, at least since the late 2000s information about the document, that is its metadata, was searchable and findable through WorldCat via the WorldCat website and through search engines such as Google Books and Google Scholar. It had become *wwwisible*, but it remained overlooked.

It remained overlooked until November 2016 when the fleeting mention of Arnesen's study in Vincent Sherry's introduction to his *The Cambridge History of Modernism* gave Arnesen a shade of space in 'the history of Modernism.' Except for the two aforementioned bibliographical references from the early 1930s and for my own,⁷⁰ of course no references to Arnesen's study exist before Vincent Sherry's.⁷¹

The questions 'Why and how was Arnesen's study found?' have not been answered yet. Answering it I can only speak for myself. It was found because it does fulfil the minimum criterion with regard to today's visibility threshold: information about it can be found searching online. But as Latham and Rogers write, "[a] Google search for the term 'modernism' [...] returns millions of results."⁷² Those millions of results must in fact be understood as the veil that conceals the visibility threshold. So we have to reconsider the implications of the functioning of search engine, catalog and database

searching. I was searching for early uses of the terms *modernism* and *modernist*.⁷³ Google Books, it feels almost curious to emphasize the point, was certainly the most powerful search tool for this type of research – the full-text search of an immense corpus of monographs and other formats, unprecedented and, despite the partly justified criticism put forward, a search haven for scholars. It offered unheard-of possibilities for a certain type of research. When I was doing these searches (in 2012), Arnesen's study was findable through Google Books search; now it is findable only through Google Scholar search. To be more precise, I was doing, among other searches in databases such as *The Modernist Journals Project*, extensive Google Books searches, for the search terms *modernism*, *modernist(s)*, limiting these searches to publications of the early twentieth century and eventually limiting searches to intitle searches. Eventually Arnesen turned up in one of the search results lists. What was found was in fact the following metadata of Arnesen's study: the title (Modernism and Literature), the author's name (Elias Thorleif Arnesen), and the year of publication (1924). The search result was of course a No preview case – the text itself has not been digitized by Google, rather this metadata came from WorldCat due to the aforementioned collaboration between OCLC and Google.⁷⁴

The relevance of the study for a literary scholar was not immediately recognizable on the basis of the metadata which the Google Books search result provided. It could have been another early twentieth-century ecclesiastic tract carrying the term modernism in its title. But what the metadata provided was well enough to search the document in WorldCat, which offered the greater scope of information provided by the University of Washington Library cataloging staff in 1989, including the Library of Congress subject heading "Literature, Modern -- History and criticism" and the information that the document is a PhD thesis written at University of Washington – just enough information, in other words, to extend the attention of someone searching for early uses of the term (literary) *modernism*. Without the metadata retrieved by the Google Books search, it must be said, it would have been very difficult to find Arnesen's study through WorldCat searches alone, as I have attempted in numerous alternative searches, basically because its search is far less effective, in particular regarding non-known-item searching. Google's search precision and search results precision easily eclipsed WorldCat's, after all its search engines have become the most convenient and most powerful

tools influencing current research search strategies for a reason. But in the end it was the linking of the most powerful World Wide Web search tool with WorldCat's immense metadata stock that ensured the document's visibility.⁷⁵ What is gained in terms of *Erkenntnisgewinn*? If the obvious is to make use of verbalizing then it is certainly this: *How we search (still) determines what we will find*.

We could lean back and contend ourselves with the thought that it does not make so much of a difference if we put Riding and Graves at the beginning of the critical genealogy of 'the concept of *Modernism*,' or Wilson, or Arnesen, and that the important things do come down to us. But what if not? What if such discourse-generating texts as Benjamins "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," Bakhtin's *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Art*, or Fleck's *The Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*, all three of which had to be rediscovered in a certain sense, would be buried in the deep archive? Writings not having the great effect they could have because for some reason they have been consigned to the deep archive. Could we allow ourselves to be ignorant of them? This is the kind of tormenting question that is raised by the awareness of the deep archive. To be sure, Arnesen's study is not of such caliber. In particular since it is an instance of the kind of 'impressionistic' criticism – Arnesen himself refers to "the little impressionistic sketches of modern writers" (Arnesen, "Modernism," 295) which comprise his study inter alia – which was more and more deprecated in the course of the twentieth century by a literary criticism which had grown weary of such an approach to literature and which conceived itself as a methodologically and theoretically more sophisticated academic endeavor. In Arnesen, as in so many other instances of the literary criticism not only of the early twentieth century there is a perpetual swinging of the critic's pendulum from praise to blame and back and forth regarding the works under consideration. And yet we tend to concede a certain importance to those who first define a literary movement, those having their finger on the pulse of current art affairs, those whose critical appraisal is accurate enough to distinguish the soon-to-be canonical writers from the other ones. It is the prestige reserved for those who happen to have the keen sense of far-sighted critical judgement. As unsatisfactory as some of Arnesen's judgments and consideration may appear, given the fact that we are here dealing with a critical reaction to the immediacy of the provocation of a complex art phenomenon,⁷⁶ I find it not a settled matter at all that

this impressionistic approach should be entirely without value for our, i.e. for today's consideration of Arnesen's study. In any event it must be judged as a study from 1924, not as one from 2017.

The debate in the humanities and in literary studies is rich and diverse, and the issue of the deep archive is certainly not a discipline-specific or subject-specific phenomenon. An ever vaster quantity of database content, research documents and digitized texts is becoming ever more conveniently accessible. But the view of this new world of possibility should at the same time make us aware how much still remains below the new visibility threshold. At a time when the question of access is more and more becoming an ethical one, the issue of the deep archive becomes as urgent as that of the deep web. The difference is, whereas the deep web is a question to which consideration is given, the deep archive is not. The larger issue looming behind not taking the deep archive into account is the effect of limiting the academic discourse. There is the danger, with the convenience of easy access, that we limit our research to what is conveniently accessible. In the final analysis the result would be that we are all telling a more and more homogeneous story of a given topic. This would be an intellectual impoverishment, and the breeding ground of scholarly master narratives. Source diversity is one of the prerequisites of research diversity. *Research*, etymologists point out, goes back to Late Latin *circare* 'to go around,' which implies at the same time 'to have a way to go'. The changing search and research strategies and the concomitant information behavior make it appear possible to venture a prediction about which documents will remain below the visibility threshold and will thus go unnoticed in the future by research generations who will be 'digital natives.' The assumption being that the more documents are visible online, either through being digitized or through information about them being searchable and findable online, the more will *www*visibility become the criterion of exclusion with respect to the body of documents that is taken into consideration as object of research. If this article would be read as a discovery of Elias Arnesen's study its intention would be misconceived in many respects. It is the awareness of the deep archive and its unexploited potential which is the issue at stake here. Arnesen's study is no less than a case in point. If it is true that the "New Modernist Studies" is fed by "the desire for [...] new texts,"⁷⁷ the deep archive could become a site of satisfaction.

¹ The research presented here would not have been possible without the assistance of the University of Washington Libraries' Special Collections staff and of San Francisco State University library's Special Collections staff. I would also like to thank Douglas Mao (Johns Hopkins) and Vivien Petras (Humboldt-Universität) for their thoughts and perspective, and the Q-Team "Scholarly Forgetting" (Humboldt-Universität) for productive discussions.

² See Sean Latham and Gayle Rogers, *Modernism: Evolution of an Idea* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2015). Cf. Vincent Sherry, "Introduction: A History of 'Modernism,'" in *The Cambridge History of Modernism*, ed. Sherry (Cambridge/UK: CUP, 2016), 12.

³ John Crowe Ransom, "The Future of Poetry," *The Fugitive* 3, no. 1 (Feb. 1924): 2, *Modern American Poetry Site*, Department of English, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/m_r/ransom/future.htm.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ See, e.g., Latham and Rogers, *Modernism*, 35, 50, 17-66.

⁶ The question "What is [literary] Modernism?" had already been asked in 1918 by Harold John Massingham but of course at this point not with *Ulysses* or *The Waste Land* in mind (see Harold John Massingham, "The World of Books," *The Nation* 23, no. 6 (11 May 1918): 144).

⁷ Matei Calinescu, *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*, rev. ed. (Durham/NC: Duke UP, 1987), 85.

⁸ See Wolfgang G. Stock and Mechtilde Stock, *Handbook of Information Science* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 152ff.

⁹ Elias Thorleif Arnesen, "Modernism and Literature," diss., Univ. of Washington, unpublished, 1924, 2 (Arnesen's emphasis). Further citations of this dissertation are given in the text. Since it is unpublished, I will quote copiously from Arnesen.

¹⁰ In 1976, in their introduction to the volume *Modernism*, Bradbury and McFarlane feel compelled to emphasize, in an unaware echo of Arnesen, "Modernism does indeed exist" (Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, "The Name and Nature of Modernism," in *Modernism, 1890-1930*, eds. Bradbury and McFarlane (London and New York: Penguin, 1991), 23).

¹¹ Hugh Kenner, "The Making of the Modernist Canon," *Chicago Review* (Spring 1984): 50.

¹² The inclusion of Cabell may be due to Parrington's championing of him (see Vernon Louis Parrington, *The Beginnings of Critical Realism in America*, vol. 3 of *Main Currents in American Thought: An Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1930), 335-345).

¹³ Latham and Rogers, *Modernism*, 69.

¹⁴ Calling *Ulysses* "a book for all and for none" is particularly suggestive given the fact that Arnesen is writing about it at a time when the book was banned both in the United States and in England.

¹⁵ In his study, Arnesen never writes *modernism* with a capital letter – in contrast to the other art movements which he mentions and which he usually capitalizes.

¹⁶ Perhaps Arnesen's idea of it could also be outlined "the advanced type of consciousness and sensibility [as it became manifest from the 1890s on], in so far as these are reflected in [art]" (Janko Lavrin, *Aspects of Modernism: From Wilde to Pirandello* (Freeport/NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1968), 9, *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/details/aspectsmoderni00lavrin>). By suggesting, in the mid-1930s, that this is what the terms *modern* and *modernism* stand for, Janko Lavrin is, to a certain extent, in line with Arnesen's conceptualization of the latter term.

¹⁷ In contrast to Wilson for instance, Arnesen considers Symbolism, which he writes with a capital letter, to be a predecessor movement of modernism, but one which does not extend to the present (see Arnesen, "Modernism," 195).

¹⁸ The human mind was generally a pervasive topic of the literary criticism of the 1920s due to the vogue of psychology and psychoanalysis; I. A. Richards's preoccupation with 'the mind' and 'states of mind' is but one example.

¹⁹ The year 1923 marked the climax of the German hyperinflation.

²⁰ It is revealing not only because Arnesen elsewhere refers to Alfred Stieglitz "who first introduced America to modernist art at his studio '291' on Fifth Avenue" (Arnesen, "Modernism," 95).

²¹ I attempted to roughly provide a context in terms of *Begriffsgeschichte* for Arnesen's use of the term on a previous occasion which is further contextualized by this paper (see Philipp Rößler, "The Haecceitancy of Reading James Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*: Ways of Sensemaking," dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, 2015, Open Access, PDF/A-1b, 305-308, *Dissertationen Online (Freie Universität Berlin)*, http://www.diss.fu-berlin.de/diss/receive/FUDISS_thesis_000000098816).

- ²² J. Nilsen Laurvik, "Intolerance in Art; Apropos the Exhibition of Scandinavian Art," in *The American-Scandinavian Review* 1, no. 2 (March 1913): 14, *HathiTrust*, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.32044019964881>.
- ²³ J. Nilsen Laurvik, "Post Scriptum: Apropos New Tendencies," in *Catalogue De Luxe of the Department of Fine Arts Panama-Pacific International Exposition*, ed. John E. D. Trask (San Francisco: Paul Elder, 1915), 129, *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/details/cataloguedeluxe01pana>.
- ²⁴ Christian Brinton, "Evolution Not Revolution in Art," *The International Studio* 69, no. 194 (April 1913): xxxiii, *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/details/internationalstu49newy>. See also Christian Brinton, "Fashion's in Art," *The International Studio* 69, no. 194 (April 1913): iii-x, *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/details/internationalstu49newy>.
- ²⁵ Brinton, "Evolution," xxxiii.
- ²⁶ Christian Brinton, "Modernism in Art," in *Exhibition of Paintings by Members of the Société Anonyme, catalogue*, (Worcester/MA: Worcester Art Museum, 1921), n. pag., *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/stream/exhibitionofpain00wyer>; my emphasis.
- ²⁷ J. Nilsen Laurvik, *Is it Art?: Post-Impressionism, Futurism, Cubism* (New York: International Press, 1913), 1-34, *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/details/isitartpostimpre00laur>.
- ²⁸ Laurvik occasionally contributed articles to Stieglitz' *Camera Work*, see e.g. the *What is '291'?* issue (No. 47) from July 1914 in which, among many others, both Laurvik and Brinton consider the significance of Stieglitz' gallery.
- ²⁹ See *The American-Scandinavian Review*, ed. Henry Goddard Leach (New York: American-Scandinavian Foundation, 1913-1974), *HathiTrust*, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000521420>.
- ³⁰ See *Vanity Fair*, ed. Frank Crowninshield (New York: Condé Nast Publications, 1914-1936), *HathiTrust*, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000493895>.
- ³¹ In the September 1914 issue of *Vanity Fair*, the magazine, celebrating its one year anniversary, was congratulated by H(enr)y Mayer with the words: "Delighted to meet you on the high road of Modernism. Long may we jog along together" ("Vanity Fair has a Party," *Vanity Fair* 3, no. 1 (Sept. 1914): 24).
- ³² See Jean Cocteau, "Parade: Ballet Réaliste; In Which Four Modernist Artists Had a Hand," *Vanity Fair* 9, no. 1 (Sept. 1917): 37, 106, *HathiTrust*, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015041171904>.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, 37 (my emphasis).
- ³⁴ Holbrook Jackson, "A Plea for Revolt in Attitude," *Rhythm* 1, no. 3 (Winter 1911): 8, *The Modernist Journals Project*, http://modjourn.org/render.php?view=mjp_object&id=1159905483482363.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 9. The terms also occur in Jackson's well-known study *The Eighteen Nineties* from 1913 (see Holbrook Jackson, *The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (London: Grant Richards, 1913), *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/details/eighteenineties01jackuoft>).
- ³⁶ Edith A. Browne, "Free Art," *The Freewoman* 17, no. 1 (14 March 1912): 330, *The Modernist Journals Project*, http://www.modjourn.org/render.php?view=mjp_object&id=FreewomanCollection.
- ³⁷ Francis de Miomandre, "Jules Laforgue," *Mercure de France* 45, no. 158 (Febr. 1903): 291, 314.
- ³⁸ Francis Lamont Peirce, "Bernard Shaw: A Prophet Who Laughs," *The Twentieth Century Magazine* 4 (April-Oct. 1911): 18, *HathiTrust*, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433081655106>.
- ³⁹ Brinton, "Evolution," xxxiii.
- ⁴⁰ Arthur Davison Ficke, "Modern Tendencies in Poetry," *The North American Review* 204, no. 730 (Sep. 1916): 442-445.
- ⁴¹ Philip Greeley Clapp, "Sebastian Bach, Modernist," *The Musical Quarterly* 2, no. 2 (Apr. 1916): 295-313.
- ⁴² Alice Williams Brotherton, "Debasing the Poetic Coinage the Quality and Function of Poetry," *The Art World* 2, no. 2 (May 1917): 148f.
- ⁴³ Petronius Arbiter, "What Is Poetry?," *The Art World* 3, no. 6 (March 1918): 508, 510.
- ⁴⁴ Montmorency was a Barrister-at-law and Quain Professor of Comparative Law at the University of London between 1920 and 1932.
- ⁴⁵ James Edward Geoffrey de Montmorency, "Modernism and Literature," *The Contemporary Review* 100 (Oct. 1911): 582 (my emphasis).
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 581f (my emphasis).
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 582f (my emphasis).
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 584 (Montmorency's emphasis).
- ⁵¹ See Gallica, the digital library of the Bibliothèque nationale de France; see also Latham and Rogers, *Modernism*, 20.

⁵² Johann Baptist Schlachter, "Neufranzösisches," in *Fünftes Programm der K. K. III. Deutschen Staatsrealschule in Prag-Neustadt, Heinrichsgasse; veröffentlicht am Schlusse des Schuljahres 1902-1903* (Prague: K. K. III. Deutsche Staatsrealschule, 1903), 8. All quotations from Schlachter are my translations.

⁵³ Ibid., 7.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 11. Indeed the terms are neither included, or not with the meaning Schlachter gives, in Hatzfeld and Darmesteter's *Dictionnaire général de la langue française* (1895); in Littré's *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (1883); nor in Beaujean's abridged version of Littré's *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (1900); in Larousse's *Nouveau Larousse illustré* (1898); in Colin's *Dictionnaire encyclopédique illustré* (1900); in Larousse's *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIXe siècle* (1874). In contrast, in Guérin's *Dictionnaire des dictionnaires* (ca. 1892) one finds among other meanings: "Moderniste s. m. [...] Littér. et B.-Arts. Auteur, artiste s'attachant à la modernité. En peinture, Manet est le type du moderniste. adj. [...] Ecrivain, école moderniste" (Paul Guérin, *Dictionnaire des dictionnaires. Lettres, sciences, arts, encyclopédie universelle*, vol. 5, (Paris: Impr. Réunies, ca. 1892), 211, *Gallica*, <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k201379d>).

⁵⁵ Schlachter, "Neufranzösisches," 7. Other neologisms Schlachter lists (see *ibid.*, 10ff) are *automobiliste* 'automobile driver,' *ibsenisme* 'school, movement of Ibsen,' *vers-librisme* "the theory of French verse freed from the strict rules of classical prosody, the *vers libre*" (*ibid.*, 13), *vers-libriste* "poet who writes in *vers-libres*" (*ibid.*).

⁵⁶ Ibid., 8.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 9.

⁵⁸ See *ibid.*

⁵⁹ The biographical information provided by Hofstead is incorrect in several respects. According to Hofstead, Arnesen was born on September 21, 1899 at Vrangfoss in county Telemark (see John A. Hofstead, "Arnesen, Elias Thorleif Ruud," in *American Educators of Norwegian Origin: A Biographical Dictionary*, ed. Hofstead (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1931), 13).

⁶⁰ A. T. Caskie, "Dr. Elias Arnesen Here Again for Summer Term," *Mexico City Collegian* (10 July 1952): n. pag., *Digital Archive of Universidad de las Américas Puebla*, Colección del Mexico City College, http://catarina.udlap.mx/u_dl_a/acer vos/mcc/volumen_06/1953_07_10.pdf.

⁶¹ Elias Thorleif Arnesen, "Knut Hamsun," *The Pacific Review* 2 (June 1921): 77-88, *Internet Archive*, <https://archive.org/details/pacificreview00unkngoog>.

⁶² Had Arnesen read the following passage by Bradbury, would he have recollected how he approached his own project sixty years earlier? "[T]here are certain phases in the history of the arts when we sense, as critics and interpreters, the emergence of a general, a widespread, and a distinctive new phase of perception, structure, form, and style [...]. Here we advance, usually *post facto* and for very large generalizing purposes, proposals that attempt to designate entire and long-lasting periods of artistic history and identify their distinctive qualities, the sum of the plural parts, the historical episteme. For our century, we have already settled on one such term, Modernism [...]" (Malcolm Bradbury, "Modernisms/Postmodernisms," in *Innovation/Renovation: New Perspectives on the Humanities*, eds. Ihab Hassan and Sally Hassan (Madison/WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1983), 312). Would he have recognized his modernism in Bradbury's Modernism?

⁶³ Caskie, "Arnesen."

⁶⁴ Parrington, *Beginnings*, xxxviii.

⁶⁵ "Chittick," in *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, vol. 58, (Clifton/NJ: James T. White, 1979), 593.

⁶⁶ Latham and Rogers, *Modernism*, back cover.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 3.

⁶⁸ "Modernism in Literature; Elias Thorleif Ruud Arnesen, 1925," in *Digests of Theses, 1914-1931*, vol. 1, University of Washington Publications (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1931), 127-129.

⁶⁹ "797. Arnesen, Elias T. R.," in *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*, vol. 13, 1932, ed. Mary S. Serjeantson (Cambridge/UK: Bowes & Bowes, 1933), 50.

⁷⁰ See Rößler, "Haecceitancy," 78ff.

⁷¹ Therefore, it is somewhat surprising that the study was findable through Google Scholar before. If Google Scholar would retrieve the Arnesen metadata on the basis of the references in either the *University of Washington Digests of Theses* or the *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* rather than using the data as provided by WorldCat, the title of Arnesen's study would have to be shown as "Modernism in Literature" since the *Digests* wrongly gives this as the study's title and the *Bibliography* follows it in this respect as the *Digests* reference entry of Arnesen's thesis is the basis of the *Bibliography*'s reference entry. Google Scholar, as did Google Books before, provides the correct title information, i.e. "Modernism and Literature," for which no reference other than the WorldCat record of the document existed before 2015. It also gives the correct 'publication' date, 1924, whereas the *Digests* says 1925 and the *Bibliography* has 1931.

⁷² Latham and Rogers, *Modernism*, 10f.

⁷³ See fn. 21 above.

⁷⁴ In Google Scholar the Arnesen search result is a [CITATION] case.

⁷⁵ Describing and thus making explicit one's digital (re-) search strategies as done above could be part of not just humanities scholars' research data collection.

⁷⁶ It is interesting to see that of the references listed in Arnesen's footnotes there are almost none which can be considered criticism of the contemporary canon he projects – secondary literature had yet to be written. Edmund Wilson's review of *The Waste Land* "The Poetry of Drouth" from 1922 (see Arnesen, "Modernism," 83, 299) is among the few pieces in that list which can indeed be considered criticism of the contemporary literature Arnesen is writing about. Furthermore, names such as Babbitt, More, Brooks and Mencken do not occur in Arnesen's study.

⁷⁷ Latham and Rogers, *Modernism*, 15.

Title page image:

View of busy Fifth Avenue with B. Altman and Company department store (now Graduate Center, CUNY) in the center, as seen from the old Waldorf-Astoria (now the site of the Empire State Building) in 1924.

This image, from the Murray Hill Collection, is used by permission of The Graduate Center, City University of New York.